

Reinforcing the European dimension of comparative police research

Cyrille Fijnaut
The Netherlands



(2008 Conference in Traiskirchen)

Comparative research in the field of policing: a few historical notes

The French blueprint for policing in Europe

Going back to the 18th century, it is quite amazing to see how the police force in Paris, and later on the police force in Vienna, were blueprints or models for policing big cities all over Europe. For example the French Gendarmerie — built up step by step in the 18th century and harmonised and pushed up to a national level during the French Revolution — it is important to know that in Napoleonic times this force was introduced all over Western and Central Europe (Fijnaut, 2002). That's to say that quite harmonised policing systems came into existence all over Europe at that time. Many states had split up their police into, on the one hand, civilian city police forces under the chairmanship of a police commissioner and on the other hand more military police forces like the gendarmerie. This evolution was quite important in the framework of police cooperation (Emsley, 1999).

Those interested in the problem of banditry in Europe — the forerunner of organised crime at the end of the 18th and in the first half of the 19th century — know that exactly those police forces that were based on the gendarmerie concept could cooperate across borders quite smoothly, because they were all based on the same military concept, used the same organisational structures and functioned in similar ways operationally. This is why they could rather easily defeat the international, cross-border,

professional criminal networks that operated in Europe as early as the 18th century. Exactly that harmonisation that took place in the field of policing as a result of the Napoleonic wars was in the end one of the most important developments to deal with cross-border crime in Europe (Egmond, 1986).

And if one looks at the history of policing in Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries — I wrote my Ph.D. thesis on the political history of policing in Europe, taking into account the developments in the UK, Germany, Austria, Spain, Italy and the Netherlands, at Leuven University in Belgium — then it becomes clear that the national police systems interacted actively and to some extent borrowed from each other in order to improve their own structures and their own operations. I can give you a few examples to remind you of this quite interesting aspect of the history of policing in Europe.

One example relates to the French model that was disputed after the Napoleonic wars — it was seen as an oppressive, authoritarian form of policing. This is the reason why the new Metropolitan Police Force of London, established in 1829 and 1830, was seen as a very good alternative to the more autocratic, military, oppressive policing in France. After 1830 many police forces in big cities in Europe copied the London model. They did so in Amsterdam, in some German cities and later on even in Paris in some respect (Fijnaut, 1979).

The role of Germany and Austria in European policing

And as far as the 20th century is concerned, everybody involved in police research, and particularly in comparative analysis, should know that the Weimar police had to deal with huge challenges, in several ways far greater and more complicated than the challenges we face today on a European level, and that this was the reason why this police force became such a modern, professional police force. Police officers from all over Europe came to Berlin to see how one should organise a qualified police force. The literature about the international police exhibitions of 1925 and 1926 in Germany demonstrates how police in Europe came together to exchange ideas and practices and to learn about each other. The police of the Weimar Republic was seen as a model for policing in Europe (Liang, 1970; Bessel, 1991; Meershoek, 2007, 178-181).

But not only policing as such in countries like Germany, Austria or France had a major impact on cross-border policing in the European context. We should not forget that there were two other driving forces behind cross-border comparison and implementation of new forms of policing.

The first one I would like to mention are important treaties. For example, the treaty on the containment of white slavery from the beginning of the 20th century stimulated the establishment of special units in police forces all over Europe, and to some extent all over the world, to deal with trafficking of women. All in all, such international treaties were an important influence (Andreas and Nadelmann, 2006).

Secondly, one should remember that the establishment of Interpol in 1923 at the initiative of *Polizeipräsident* Schober, chief constable of Vienna, has reinforced harmonisation in policing in Europe as well. Because if one wants to cooperate in a smooth and effective manner, this presupposes to some extent the harmonisation and standardisation of policing in Member States. When looking at the history of the national units that are currently linked to Europol for example, one would see that Interpol was not only the first institution that opened national offices in the Member States, but also the idea that you should harmonize the ways in which police systems are organised in order to further their mutual

cooperation — at least in those areas that are very important for more and closer cross-border operations (Jager, 2006, 255-338; Deflem, 2002, 124-152; Marabuto, 1935).

Take, for example, the issue of car theft, which was a problem of considerable proportions already in the 1920s. Interpol stipulated that all over Europe police forces should establish car theft units in order to be able to cooperate much easier, faster and more effectively across borders. In short: there was a lot more cross-border cooperation and harmonisation on an operational level happening before WWII than many people are aware of.

The important impact of the UK and the United States

After WWII, policing in the UK became very influential, notably with regard to policing in continental Europe. When analysing the history of the Metropolitan Police of London and its impact in many fields of policing in continental Europe — e.g. women policing, traffic policing, community policing — one would easily come to the conclusion that this particular police force has greatly influenced policing in continental Europe in the second half of the 20th century.

And from the 1960s on we see a huge impact from the United States on policing in continental Europe. From the moment the federal government of the United States stated that policing should be an important part of American foreign policy — it actually developed a foreign police policy — police forces in Europe were influenced immediately by this decision. I will give two examples.

'New' undercover policing was developed in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s to deal with organised crime and organised drug trafficking in particular. The federal police services later on introduced undercover policing 'American style' all over Europe. They pushed authorities in many European states to adapt the powers and operational tactics of their police and judicial bodies to the forms of undercover policing developed in the United States (Nadelmann, 1993, 189-250).

Another example is that of community policing, developed in the 1960s in the United States: how

to deal with neighbourhoods where sections of the population are in conflict with one another or oppose the government? How to deal with such neighbourhoods in terms of policing? In many European countries (e.g. the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands and Belgium) the notions of community policing or neighbourhood policing were very influential (Fijnaut, 2007, 863-879).

The lack of historical knowledge in everyday policing

For the rest, it's amazing that we don't know much about all this. In a European context, policing has never just been a national issue, because it had always been influenced highly by developments in other states that belonged to what we nowadays call the Council of Europe or the EU. We did not write about it, however, and we did no research about it. I can give you just one example, a Dutch example.

In the Netherlands, three historians and I wrote a four-volume book on the history of the Dutch police in the 19th and 20th century a few years ago. Many leading police officers in the Netherlands have no idea about its history. They only know about policing from their own experiences. History is something that people are reminded of when police chiefs leave or new police headquarters are opened. But if one takes an in-depth look at the mechanisms and dynamics of policing in a long-term, historical perspective, one can easily see — in the Dutch case, for example — how influential 'Europe' has been on policing in the Netherlands (Fijnaut, 2008a).

The concrete example is the reorganisation of the Rotterdam police force that took place at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Rotterdam was a booming harbour city in those days, but still had an old-fashioned 18th-century police force. This force couldn't deal with the challenges that this city presented to policing. The local authorities appointed a young mayor from a neighbouring municipality, H. Voormolen, 34-years old and a former member of the army in the Dutch Indies, as chief constable. They assigned him with the task of building a new police force in Rotterdam. To that end, they provided him with a budget to travel around in Europe in order to find out what was then the pinnacle of policing. He travelled to the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Austria and

the Scandinavian countries, where he particularly paid attention to policing in harbour cities. Finally, he came up with a blueprint for the new Rotterdam police force he envisioned and got permission from the Rotterdam authorities to implement this European standardised blueprint for policing in Rotterdam. This, in my view, is a wonderful example of how European policing has been at times in the 19th and 20th centuries (Fijnaut, 2007, 291-305).

Two remarkable American studies

An interesting point in this context is the literature on policing in Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries; one can find a few exceptional pieces of comparative research on police forces and on the impact that international developments have had on policing practice in Europe. I refer to a wonderful book that perhaps only researchers know. Just before WW1, the New York police authorities came to the conclusion that they should modernise their police force completely. They couldn't find any good examples on which to model their system in the United States so they sent Raymond B. Fosdick, the former Commissioner of Accounts for the city of New York, to Europe to look at how policing was organised in the UK and a number of continental states.

In 1916, Fosdick published a wonderful book, *European Police Systems*, one of the first good examples of comparative research on policing in Europe. In this book we see how the police was organised in Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and in the UK, and what similarities and differences existed between them, and what, according to Fosdick, would be the best way of organising the New York City Police Department (Fosdick 1916).

Those interested in what happened in the transatlantic interchange of views and practices in the field of undercover policing in the 1960s and 1970s, should read the wonderful book *Cops Across Borders*, written by E. Nadelmann (1993). He was one of the few researchers in the United States who could get access to members of the FBI and DEA. Nadelman demonstrates in terms of comparison how important and how influential the American foreign policing policy has been on a.o. undercover policing in Europe.

This brings me to my second point.

Ongoing developments in cross-border police cooperation

A serious lack of in-depth comparative research

There is an enormous necessity for comparative police research in Europe looking at the development of cross-border police cooperation. If one compares the quantity of research vis-à-vis the developments in policing and particularly in police cooperation, there is a huge gap. Of course, there is research comparing the police of the Netherlands and Belgium for example, or the police of France and police in the UK (Fijnaut, 1992). And research has been done into specific aspects of policing, for example on how to contain football hooligans or how to deal with community policing, or traffic policing. But that's just bits and pieces. There is no coherent, consistent, long-term building of a body of knowledge about what is going on in the field of policing in Europe and particularly related to cross-border police cooperation.

The influential role of conventions

That is why I first of all would like to underline that if states want to further develop cross-border police cooperation in Europe, they should know each other much better than is the case these days. And why is it so important to develop comparative analysis? If one looks at this question from the perspective of cross-border and international police cooperation then one sees that cooperation has increased enormously in the last 10 to 15 years. In the 1970s and 1980s police cooperation in Europe was quite limited; it was — generally speaking — more incidental. But these days it has become a component of mainstream policing in Europe.

Talking with police officers in the 1980s in the Netherlands and in Belgium as well as in Germany and France revealed that they did not like treaties. They were afraid that treaties would limit their discretionary power to deal with each other across borders. I always criticised this view, because this was an old-fashioned view, in my opinion. If you saw what was happening in the framework of the EU it was clear that one would need more or less formal agreements in order to further cross-border policing. And if you look at the related conventions at the EU level—I am referring to the Schengen Implementation Convention, the Europol

Convention, the Mutual Assistance Convention and the Prüm Treaty — it is amazing that in 20 years time many possibilities to cooperate in a formal, legitimate manner have been realised, thanks to all these treaties (Berthelet, 2009; Möllers and Van Ooyen, 2009; Fijnaut, 2010).

The necessity of using these possibilities is quite clear. Most organised crime in Europe relates to the delivery of goods and services on the black market — it may be trafficking in stolen art, trafficking of stolen cars, trafficking of women — it is all about moving people, services and goods across borders. That is the main problem of organised crime in the EU. It makes it quite understandable why criminal investigation has become more and more cross-border, because serious crime has gained a much more of international dimension than in the past (Fijnaut and Paoli, 2006).

It is not only organised crime; however, that is a driving force behind much more police cooperation. Also public order topics play a role here: football hooliganism in Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and France also gained an increasingly transnational dimension; Dutch police officers from time to time operate on Belgian, French or German territory and vice versa (Adang and Cuvelier, 2001; Della Porta, Peterson and Reiter, 2006; Adang and Brown, 2008; Tsoukala, 2009). And terrorism has equally furthered cross-border policing to some extent (Friedrichs, 2008).

The developments in the Euroregion Meuse-Rhine

However, one should not only look at what is going on at the EU level. When visiting border areas in Member States, one can see even more progressive and influential developments in this field. Over the past five years I have done a lot of research with colleagues from Tilburg University and Leuven University on police and judicial cooperation in the area of Maastricht (the Netherlands), Aachen (Germany) and Liège (Lüttich) (Belgium), the so-called Euroregion Meuse-Rhine — one of the most densely populated areas in the European Union (Fijnaut and Spapens, 2005). When looking at how not only police cooperation but also judicial cooperation has developed in that area, it is quite amazing to see how the authorities in this area try to deal with common problems by organising cooperation at a much higher level than would have been possible at an EU level (Fijnaut and Spapens, 2010).

Public prosecutors in this area, for example, have built a special bureau and cooperate closely when it comes to handling requests for mutual assistance or when it comes to priorities in criminal investigations and prosecution. The police authorities have established a police cooperation centre in Heerlen — like one set up before in Kehl (Germany) to facilitate cooperation between Germany and France—where Dutch, Belgian and German police officers work together in the same one room. These officers have access to police databases in Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands at the same time and have an intranet at their disposal so that they can easily exchange relevant information from their national databases. And these days many operational police officers call ‘Heerlen’ to get the real-time information they need to do their jobs on the streets of Maastricht, Aachen or Liège (Lüttich).

Therefore — in order to understand what’s going on in the field of police cooperation — it’s not enough to look at what’s going on at the EU level, but to look at developments in these border areas as well.

Important developments in specific areas of policing

I would also like to pay some attention to forms of specific police cooperation that have been established in the EU. Just look at the research literature. Most of it is spent on treaties and agreements on police cooperation in general. It disregards to a large extent police cooperation in border areas, and pays no attention at all to police cooperation in specific areas. I will give you two examples.

The core business of the EU is the free market — which means that we have abolished control at the internal borders to facilitate the free flow of capital, services, goods and people. That includes that important traffic corridors have come into existence. Who’s policing the European motorways, rivers and airways? However, they make up the infrastructure of the whole internal market. Therefore it is very important to know how policing on these corridors, and of course in the harbours and at the airports, is taking place.

Over the past few years, some police officers have established the European Traffic Police Network (TISPOL) in order to connect traffic police departments all over the EU to improve policing these corridors. This

is a very important development, not only with regard to traffic safety in these corridors, but also in relation to e.g. trafficking women: they are also transported via these corridors. So, if one wants to deal with the trafficking of women one should, indeed, take into account the red light districts in Amsterdam, Brussels or Frankfurt, but also what’s going on in these European corridors (Hellemons, 2010).

Another example is the ATLAS initiative. The special police forces of the Member States cooperate under the umbrella of this acronym. However, it is infrequently referenced. I wrote a report for the Dutch government a few years ago about the restructuring of the special units in the Dutch police. To do this, I found that one should keep in mind that the Dutch units in some cases should be able to cooperate closely with their German, Belgian, French and British counterparts. I visited these countries to have a look at how their special forces are organised and under what conditions they could cooperate operationally. The ATLAS framework is very helpful in facilitating the exchange of information about equipment, strategy and tactics. It’s no surprise that the related forces have common exercises on Dutch territory, for example (Fijnaut, 2004; Council, 2008).

The possible impact of the Lisbon Treaty

If one takes these examples and looks at what is going on in the EU in general it is rather clear that I should also spend a few minutes on the Lisbon Treaty and on the reports of the Future Groups. Of course, we still have to wait a few months to see whether the Treaty will enter into force — it depends to a large extent on the Czech Republic, Germany and Ireland. But even if the Lisbon Treaty does not enter into force, there are provisions in this Treaty that will have an impact on the field of police cooperation.

This can be easily demonstrated by looking at the reports of the so-called high-level Future Groups on Home Affairs and Justice respectively. The German EU Presidency established these Future Groups to prepare the ground for a new programme in the Third Pillar, the area of freedom, security and justice. In June 2008, the Future Groups published their reports, marking the first stepping stones for the Stockholm Programme (2010-2014) that will substitute the Hague Programme

(2005-2009). The Lisbon Treaty and the reports of the Future Groups not only demonstrate how important police cooperation will become, but also what this presupposes in terms of comparison and comparative research (Fijnaut, 2009).

A Copernican Revolution in the European Union

In Dutch journals I wrote about the Lisbon Treaty saying that it is a Copernican revolution: a really radical change (Fijnaut, 2008b). One should indeed not underestimate the content and the impact of this treaty. Of course politicians like to give the feeling that it is just a minor adaptation of the existing treaties. But in my view, particularly in relation to the Third Pillar, it is a radical reform and will have a radical impact. The main reason for this is that the related policy area will no longer be an intergovernmental structure. In the Lisbon Treaty the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice is a shared competence of the EU and the Member States. And in general it won't be the rule of unanimity that will govern the decision-making process, but the rule of majority instead.

The Council will gain a much more influential role, developing strategic and operational guidelines in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, which means also in the field of cross-border police cooperation. A Permanent Committee for Internal Security will be built up to support the Council. The European Commission and Member States will develop an evaluation mechanism to see to which extent Member States realise the guidelines the Council will issue. In my view all this may have a major impact on policing. If one reads all the papers, the documents, the reports and statements published in the last 5 to 10 years by the European Parliament and by the European Commission, they all complain about the fact that the Member States do not really implement what they have promised in Brussels. 'Brussels' developed programmes in the field of terrorism, in relation to the trafficking of women and with regard to the containment of illegal trade in small arms and light weapons, but these important priorities in the EU don't always get the resources they deserve in every region, every time.

How could they contain the trafficking of women when Member States are not closely cooperating? In 1993, I conducted some research for the Belgian

parliament on the trafficking of women (Fijnaut, 1993). At that time I could already see how trafficking of women is organised like a carousel in Europe. The women, in this case from the Philippines, were brought over via Cyprus, Rome, Paris and Amsterdam. They stayed for three months in the Netherlands, three months in Belgium, three months in Germany, three months in Denmark and other Scandinavian countries, three months at the Costa Brava and then they were moved to Northern Italy. How can they deal with such a problem without close cooperation between the relevant police institutions? It is nearly impossible. I also could talk about the problems in relation to the illegal trafficking of small arms and light weapons. That is the exact same story: it's all about moving weapons across the borders of the Member States. How can they effectively deal with this illegal trade when police forces are not cooperating closely? (Fijnaut, Bruggeman a.o., 2008).

And that is reflected in the Lisbon Treaty. The frustration at the Brussels level that policies are developed in important fields, but that Member States finally decide whether they are willing to pay attention to them or not; that they will select sufficient qualified police officers to conduct the investigations or not.

This will change in my view when the Lisbon Treaty comes into force. Then, step-by-step, the Council, the Commission and the Parliament will put pressure on the Member States to implement the priorities set by the Council in Brussels. Police cooperation across borders will be part of that effort. If one wants to deal with the trafficking of women in an effective manner, that presupposes — like at the end of the 19th century — that the national police and judicial systems organise themselves in an operational manner to fight this problem. One needs qualified police officers that understand the issue. Special units at a national level are necessary to easily cooperate with similar units in other Member States. One would also need prosecutors that understand the importance of the issue.

The messages of the Home Affairs Future Group

I would like to go one step further, to the reports of the Future Groups. I will discuss only the three main messages in the report of the Home Affairs Future Group concerning the field of policing (High Level Advisory Group, 2009).

First of all the authors want to strengthen the impact of the availability principle, as conceived in The Hague Programme and in the Prüm Treaty, i.e. that police forces and police officers can easily get access in an indirect manner to certain specific databases in other Member States (fingerprints, DNA characteristics and registration numbers). They cannot delve into the databases themselves but they can see whether there is a hit or not. They can then send a request for assistance to get the desired information from the database. The Home Affairs Future Group wants to reinforce this development and widen the spectrum of databases police officers can get access to.

Secondly, the Future Group wants to strengthen police cooperation in border areas. I have mentioned the example of the Heerlen coordination centre, where police forces of the Netherlands, Germany and Belgium work together. Now the Future Group wants to build a network of police cooperation centres in the border areas. This is an interesting development, because in the 1980s the dominant policy was to abolish once and for all police control on internal borders. These days the abolishment of control in border areas is being compensated by founding these cooperation centres. Taking into account the Dutch example in the city of Heerlen, it is a bright idea to do this and to construct a network of such coordination centres all over the EU. That is a very practical way of working together within a legitimate structure of policing.

But the most important issue in this future report is that of the principle of convergence. This principle really reflects the history of police cooperation in Europe: the more you can harmonise the cooperating systems, the easier it is to cooperate; harmonisation and cooperation go hand in hand. If one doesn't have a more or less equal counterpart on the other side of the border, it's really hard to cooperate effectively. Take, for example, Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands. In Germany, the police is organised at state level, in the Dutch case it's organised at a regional level and in Belgium there are a large number of very small local forces and a federal police. It's not that easy — I can guarantee you — to bring them together and to come to agreements about cooperation, because they are organised in such different ways. That is one aspect of the principle of convergence.

It is hard to talk about harmonisation in the Future Group's report, because if Member States get the idea that it is about harmonising — meaning uniformity — they will always underline that they are very special, even very exceptional, and that they have a very specific history. Most of this is pure nonsense. The police history of the 19th and 20th centuries clearly shows this. Nevertheless, one cannot talk about harmonisation in Brussels, because everything will just come to an abrupt halt. This is why a new buzzword is used, to soften what one really wants to achieve: convergence. It's an important principle, because when reading the text of the report, one will see that convergence is related to the institutional organisation of policing, that it is related to operational structures, that it is related to policing powers, that it is related to training and to equipment, and that it is related to culture as well. The authors understood that, if one wants to facilitate and to reinforce cross-border cooperation among police forces, one must converge the systems, or otherwise it will prove to be extremely difficult. I can only confirm this on the basis of my research in the Euroregion Meuse-Rhine. If the systems are highly divergent, it is very difficult.

On top of institutional, organisational, legal and technical differences, there are otherwise two different problems. Cooperation can only be achieved if they share the same priorities and, equally important, are willing to spend a similar amount of resources on the priorities put in place. That is already quite difficult in a Euroregion like the Euroregion Meuse-Rhine, but is even harder on a European level. This of course is the reason why European authorities are generally in favour of the Lisbon Treaty. In an ideal situation one will have a criminal policy with five or six main priorities as well as police and judicial systems that are convergent at the different levels and can cooperate much better for this reason across borders at a European level.

Ways to facilitate comparative research in Europe

One can ask the question: how was it possible that although cross-border cooperation has such a long history, although police forces since long cross borders to look for examples of good policing, that the area of comparative research is so underdeveloped? There are many reasons for that. I will give you a few of them.

A nasty barrier: the language problem

The most important reason is that, although we have a long history of writing on policing — incidentally most of it is about legal issues — not that many universities in Europe have a curriculum in police research or police studies. Only in the 1960s and 1970s were the first efforts made in the Netherlands, Belgium, the UK and to some extent in Germany, to establish such curricula. In those years it was nearly impossible to find anyone who was involved in police research. How can comparative research be done if there are no researchers at a national level?

One needs researchers in the individual Member States for one main reason: the language problem. I am quite fluent in English, German, French and Dutch, but then it stops. How to deal with Italian, Spanish and all the other European languages? This aspect of police research in the European Union is very different from the situation in the United States. There one can have a research group that can easily do comparative research e.g. in New York City and in big cities in the south, without running into any language problem. The language problem is therefore a huge obstacle for comparative research in Europe.

When Letizia Paoli and I made an effort to publish a book about organised crime in the EU we brought nearly 40 researchers from 15 different Member States together. But it was a very challenging task to identify in the Member States' qualified researchers who were able to join such a comparative endeavour. It took us four years to get the book finished. And even if it is possible to find very good researchers in the different countries, not all of them will be used to writing in English i.e. there will be serious rewriting. It is very difficult to conduct comparative research in Europe in fields like ours.

The lack of support at the EU level

Secondly, the European Council, the European Commission and the European Parliament spend a lot of money on research, but they are not that willing to finance comparative police research. Huge amounts of money are handed over to companies in the field of security technology, but if social researchers ask the Commission, they can only get some peanuts. When Paoli and I took the initiative for a European research project on organised crime, it was so difficult to raise

any money that we told the Commission to keep the money; they weren't willing to pay. In the end we paid for it ourselves, together with the Max Planck Institute of Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg. It was an extremely disappointing experience. Organised crime is a big issue in the EU, but if one needs some money to build a productive European research network, 'Brussels' says that there is no money for such an initiative, because it would be too academic. This should change in the future (Fijnaut and Paoli, 2006).

Thirdly, the police forces themselves should also take the initiative. These days there is a European Police Chiefs Operational Task Force (TFPC), there is the European Police College (CEPOL), there is Europol and, finally, Frontex. They should put together a research budget which they could finance themselves. Why not? I don't understand that police chiefs in Europe are not aware of the importance of comparative research in the interest of policing in Europe. Why are they not setting up a research fund to further comparative analysis in the field of police cooperation? I believe it is also their responsibility. In any case it is not just the responsibility of individual researchers or lonely academic workers in universities. The police themselves in Europe are also responsible for this dire situation. They should do at least three things.

Three stimuli: a journal, a library and a forum

First of all, the police chiefs should — perhaps in cooperation with researchers—establish a European Police Journal. All the police journals in Europe are national journals these days. Some of them try to cover other Member States and European developments, but basically they are all national journals, e.g. the *New Police in Europe*, edited by I. Weitemeier. It is quite amazing that after two or three decades of increasing police cooperation the police chiefs in Europe have not established a European Police Journal so that they can share experiences, information, research findings and important policy developments at a national level as well as at EU level. That could be the first step to further comparative research.

Another initiative that should be taken is to establish a European police library. It could be built up in an electronic, as well as in a paper, form. In order to realise this library they need to bring together an editorial board from the Member States that could build such

a reference library, so that everyone — also in the CEPOL context — could easily have access to what is going on, in any case in Europe, but also in other parts of the world.

The third initiative should be — in the wake of what CEPOL already has achieved — establishing an annual

European police research forum for police research in general, so that people can meet each other, discuss their research and build networks in order to do comparative research in the increasingly important field of cross-border policing in the EU.

References

- Adang, O. and Brown, E. (2008) Policing Football in Europe. Experiences from Peer Review Evaluation Teams. Apeldoorn: Nederlandse Politieacademie.
- Adang, O. and Cuvelier, Ch. (2001) Policing Euro 2000. International Police Cooperation, Information Management and Police Deployment. Beek-Ubbergen: Tandem Felix.
- Andreas, P. and Nadelmann, E. (2006) Policing the Globe. Criminalization and Crime Control in International Relations. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berthelet, P. (2009) Le Paysage Européen de la Sécurité Intérieure. Bruxelles: Peter Lang.
- Bessel, R. (1991) 'Policing, Professionalization and Politics' in: Emsley, C. and Weinberger, B (eds.) Policing Western Europe. Politics, Professionalization and Public Order, 1850-1940. London: Greenwood Press, 187-218.
- Council (2008) Council Decision of 23 June 2008 on the Improvement of Cooperation between the Special Intervention Units of the Member States of the European Union in Crisis Situations. Official Journal of the European Union, 6.8.2008, L 210/73-75.
- Deflem, M. (2002) Policing World Society. Historical Foundations of International Police Cooperation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Della Porta, D., Peterson, A. and Reiter, H. (eds.) (2006) The Policing of Transnational Protest. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Egmond, F. (1986) Banditisme in de Franse Tijd. Profiel van de Grote Nederlandse Bende, Zutphen: De Bataafsche Leeuw.
- Emsley, Cl. (1999) Gendarmes and the State in Nineteenth-Century Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fosdick, R. (1916) European Police Systems. New York: The Century Corporation.
- Friedrichs, J. (2008) Fighting Terrorism and Drugs. Europe and International Police Cooperation. New York: Routledge.
- Fijnaut, C. (1979) Opdat de Macht een Toevlucht Zij? Een Historische Studie van het Politieapparaat als een Politieke Instelling. Antwerpen: Kluwer.
- Fijnaut, C. (ed.) (1992) De Reguliere Politiediensten in België en Nederland. Hun Reorganisatie en Onderlinge Samenwerking. Arnhem: Kluwer Rechtswetenschappen.
- Fijnaut, C. (1993) Officier van Justitie versus Bende van de Miljardair. Antwerpen: Kluwer
- Fijnaut, C. (2002) 'De la Gendarmerie Hollandaise à la Maréchaussée Royale des Pays-Bas (1805-1815)', in: Luc, J-N (ed.) Gendarmerie, Etat et Société au XIXe Siècle. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, pp. 423-436.
- Fijnaut, C. (2004) De Herinrichting van het Stelsel van Speciale Eenheden. Den Haag-Tilburg: Ministerie van Justitie.
- Fijnaut, C. (2007) De Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse politie. Een Staatsinstelling in de Maalstroom van de Geschiedenis. Boom: Amsterdam.
- Fijnaut, C. (2008a) A History of the Dutch Police. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Fijnaut, C. (2008b) 'Een copernicaanse Revolutie in de Europese Unie', Nederlands Juristenblad, 83(6): 335-336.
- Fijnaut, C. (2009) 'Het Voorstel voor het Stockholm Programma: een Gebrekkige Stimulus voor de Discussie over de Verdere Ontwikkeling van de Politie en Justitie Samenwerking in de Europese Unie', Panopticon, 30(6): 3-22.
- Fijnaut, C. and T. Spapens (2005) Criminaliteit en Rechtshandhaving in de Euregio Maas-Rijn. De Problemen van Transnationale (Georganiseerde) Criminaliteit en de Grensoverschrijdende Politie, Justitie en Bestuurlijke Samenwerking. Antwerpen: Intersentia.
- Fijnaut, C. and Paoli, L. (eds.) (2006) Organised Crime in Europe. Concepts, Patterns and Control Policies in the European Union and Beyond. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Fijnaut, C., Bruggeman, W. a.o. (2008) The World's Police and the Containment of the Illegal Production, the Illegal Trade and the Illegal Possession of Small Arms and Light Weaponry. A Report to the The Hague Conference 2008 of Pearls of Policing. The Hague: s.t.

- Fijnaut, C. and Spapens, T. (2010) 'The Meuse-Rhine Euroregion: a Laboratory for Police and Judicial Cooperation in the European Union' in: Lemieux, F. (ed.) *International Police Cooperation. Emerging Issues, Theory and Practice*. Cullompton: Willan, pp. 101-125.
- Hellemons, A. (2010) 'Cooperation among Traffic Police Departments in the European Union', in: Fijnaut, C. and Ouwerkerk, J. (eds.) *The Future of Police and Judicial Cooperation in the European Union*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, pp. 103-108.
- High Level Advisory Group on the Future of European Home Affairs Policy (2009) *Freedom, Security and Justice. European Home Affairs in an Open World*. Brussels, 2008.
- Jager, H. (2006) *Verfolgung durch Verwaltung. Internationales Verbrechen und internationale Polizeikooperation, 1880-1933*. Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Liang, H-H. (1970) *The Berlin Police Force in the Weimar Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marabuto, P. (1935) *La Collaboration Policière Internationale en Vue de la Prévention et de la Répression de la Criminalité*. Nice: Ecole Professionnelle Don-Bosco.
- Meershoek, G. (2007) *De Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse politie. De Gemeentepolitie in een Veranderende Samenleving*. Boom
- Möllers, M. and Van Ooyen, R. (eds.) (2009) *Europaisierung und Internationalisierung der Polizei*. Frankfurt, Verlag für Polizeiwissenschaft.
- Nadelmann, E. (1993) *Cops across Borders. The Internationalization of U.S. Criminal Law Enforcement*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Tsoukoura, A. (2009) *Football Hooliganism in Europe. Security and Civil Liberties in the Balance*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.